

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 3 have been amended.

Claim 5 has been canceled. No new claims have been added.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Brown et al. (previously applied) in view of U.S. Patent 4,611,996 to Stoner (hereafter “Stoner”).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted in Applicants’ response dated May 23, 2005, Brown et al. discloses a learning assistance system for young children (kindergarten or first graders) and/or children with hearing loss (either total or partial), or children with other types of perception impairments, such as learning disabilities (column 5, lines 56-60).

However, the present invention is directed to a method and apparatus for providing a non-impaired person with more effective foreign language training.

One distinction between the present invention and Brown et al. is the way of determining the length of the time interval between the first multimedia file and the second multimedia file. Brown et al. discloses that the amount of time for each task is autonomously and dynamically changed on the basis of the user’s performance (column 9, lines 22-37).

Therefore, the system of Brown et al. determines the length of time interval according to user’s reaction time, regardless of the file executing time, and must continuously record the user’s reaction time and then comprise a complex algorithm for calculating the time for each task.

In the present invention, the time interval is adjusted in accordance with a predetermined proportion to the first file execution time checked by the checking means, wherein the user manually selects the proportion via the input portion.

For instance, the user can set the time in the range of 150% to 70% of file executing item according to his ability. Therefore, the user's convenience and study efficiency can be highly improved.

The Examiner has cited Stoner for teaching that "the predetermined proportion is manually selected via the input portion," as recited in claim 5.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Column 7, lines 20-39 of Stoner, cited by the Examiner, disclose a maximum amount of time modifier 14 which adjusts the maximum amount of time for a student to answer a question based on whether the student has answered incorrectly (when six more counts are added to the maximum time) or incorrectly (where the count is decreased by two percent or one count, whichever is larger).

Thus, Stoner teaches that the maximum amount of time to answer is changed differently based on whether correct or incorrect answers are provided, in contrast to the present invention, in which the time interval to answer "is adjusted in accordance with a predetermined proportion to the first file executing time ...," when the predetermined proportion is manually selected via the input portion, as recited in claim 5. The "maximum time" in Stoner therefore has no relation to the length of question or "file executing time" in the present invention.

In the “Response to Arguments” section of the Office Action, the Examiner urges:

Furthermore, in Applicants’ Specification, Page 6, Line 24-Page 7, Line 5, it is suggested that a ‘time interval’ is a *part* of the ‘file executing time’ as it discloses optionally executing the file without a ‘time interval and having the time interval equal the file execution time. Thus Applicants’ subsequent ‘file executing time’ is, like Brown *et al.*’s, inclusive of a *user reaction time* (Applicants’ ‘time interval’). If the ‘file executing time’ includes the *user reaction time* and the ‘file executing time’ is used for determination of the subsequent ‘file executing time’, then the subsequent ‘file executing time’ depends on the ‘time interval’ or *user reaction time*.

Applicants do not understand this assertion.

In the present invention, the “time interval” (**Brown et al.**’s “user reaction time”) is the time that is given after executing a file until the subsequent file is executed. Thus, the “time interval” is not a part of the “file executing time.”

For example, suppose that the storage portion of the foreign language training apparatus of the present invention stores four language files, as shown in Table 1, and the predetermined proportion is 150%.

If the files are executed sequentially, first of all, “What do you eat for breakfast?” is executed for 1.61 seconds. Then the “time interval” available for learner to recite the first file is given.

Because the predetermined proportion is 150%, the “time interval” is 2.42 seconds. The predetermined proportion is manually selected via the input portion according to the learner’s ability.

Table 1

Number	File	Executing Time (sec)	Time Interval		
			70%	100%	150%
1	What do you eat for breakfast?	1.61	1.13	1.61	2.42
2	I usually eat rice and soup.	2.09	1.46	2.09	3.14
3	What do you have for lunch?	1.45	1.02	1.45	2.18
4	I have a sandwich and a banana	2.01	1.41	2.01	3.02

As the “time interval” of 2.42 seconds elapses, the subsequent file “I usually eat rice and soup” is executed for 2.09 seconds. After the subsequent file is executed, the “time interval” for the learner’s recitation is 3.14 seconds.

After a time interval of 3.14 seconds elapses, the next file “What do you have for lunch?” is executed for 1.45 seconds, and then a “time interval” of 2.18 seconds is given. Finally, the fourth file “I have a sandwich and a banana” is executed for 2.01 seconds and then a “time interval” of 3.02 seconds is given.

Through the above-mentioned example, it is apparent that the “file executing time” and the “time interval” (Brown et al.’s “user reaction time”) are different, and the “file executing time” does not include the “time interval” in the present invention.

Furthermore, the “time interval” can vary according to the learner’s selection, but the “file executing time” is fixed. The “file executing time” and the “subsequent file executing time” are

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/926,822
Response to Office Action dated August 23, 2005

also different. There is no relation between them.

The present invention is directed to determination of the "time interval" in accordance with a predetermined proportion to the first file executing time and has no relation to determination of the "subsequent file executing time."

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-4, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP
W.L.B.
William L. Brooks
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/ak
Atty. Docket No. 011753
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE